UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

REPEAL NEUTRALITY

The Neutrality Bill should never have been enacted. It was a mistaken policy then, and it is an absurdity now. America is not and should not be neutral in the current world conflict. To be neutral toward Adolf Hitler's march to world power would be national suicide, and the legal pretense of neutrality is morally scandalous. The repeal of the Neutrality Act is definitely the next item of unfinished business.

Curtis W. Reese

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 8

Chicago, October, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comment—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 123
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 126

ARTICLES—

Lindbergh, Teller of Ghost Stories—GEORGE PERLMAN 126
The Scientific Method in Solving Social Problems—ROGER PAYNE 128
From Share Cropper to Farmer—EDGAR H. WEBSTER 131
World Constitutional Convention—HERBERT ARTHUR STURGES .. 133
Everyday Life in Norway—KURT D. SINGER 134

THE STUDY TABLE—

Christianity on the Witness Stand—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 135

CORRESPONDENCE—

Mr. Jobman Replies—DAVID JOBMAN 135
An International Police—W. F. FARRELL 136
UNITY'S Fairness—G. GROTOPHORST 136
Encouragement—DAVID M. BLOCH 136

THE FIELD—

Religious Leaders Fly to Britain 122
What India Wants from England—MAHATMA GANDHI 122

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Religious Leaders Fly to Britain

In the first such flight, a Protestant minister, a Roman Catholic priest, and a Jewish rabbi have crossed the Atlantic by plane and arrived in London to study first hand the religious and social trends among the people in organized religious groups in England and Ireland.

The three American religious leaders are: Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, Presbyterian minister and president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; Father Vincent C. Donovan, a Dominican Order priest and head of the Catholic Thought Association; and Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron of Baltimore, trustee of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. The specific purposes of the trip are:

1. To secure information on the effect of the war on all the churches.
2. To discover what developments are taking place in Great Britain in respect to cooperation among citizens of different religious faiths—including members of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Evangelical churches, and the Synagogues.
3. To learn what English and Irish leaders think of the peace principles advanced by the Vatican, the Malvern conference of England's leaders, and other groups.
4. To bring back to Americans helpful knowledge as to what the "man in the street" in Britain is thinking about the post-war world and a reconstructed social order.

—NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS.

What India Wants from England

India asks from Great Britain the right to determine for herself her own future. We ask that the British Government make this possible by giving effect to the decisions of a duly elected Constituent-Assembly of India.

The decision of such an Indian Constituent-Assembly may be for complete independence—but not necessarily. It may be for less than independence or a modified form of independence. It may be even for dominion status.

Once India has decided, there may very well be an alliance with Britain. My own hope is that there will be. For it must not be thought that India is solely anti-British. She is not. She is anti-foreign rule, rather than anti-British.

We wish no harm to the British, for we distinguish between the British people and their government's policy. We have no reason to wish the British to be defeated in this war. Their defeat would connote the victory of the Nazis which we do not and must not desire. . . . We wish to meet Britain equally and honorably for the conclusion of an honorable treaty or settlement. We do not want independence as a "gift."

—MAHATMA GANDHI, in *India Today*.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII OCTOBER, 1941 No. 8

Editorial Comment

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Well, the summer has gone, and America has not gone to war. Is this to the credit of the administration? Not if Stimson and Knox have anything to say about it. These men have urged war unceasingly, and, since they are members of the Cabinet in good and regular standing, must be taken as voices of the administration. President Roosevelt's meeting with Premier Churchill was an act of war, and the famous Eight Point Declaration a declaration of war, against Germany. Mr. Roosevelt's orders to the navy to shoot are another and more dangerous act of war. Yet, we are not in the fight, since it still remains true that, so long as the Constitution is not suspended or torn up, Congress alone has the power to make war. Officially, technically, formally, legally, we are still at peace. This we count a remarkable achievement—as remarkable as it is blessed. And the reason is obvious! In spite of every endeavor to scare the people, they have refused to be scared. In the face of ceaseless efforts to loose hysteria upon the nation, the people have remained calm and sensible. The war is now more than two years old and has been accompanied by shocks and horrors unknown in the last war, and at this time relatively in the last war the popular mind was aflame with belligerency; but today this mind refuses to take fire and burn. The powder of bitterness and hate which Washington has been trying all this time to explode has been too damp to ignite. Of course, the entrance of Russia into the war as an ally of Britain was like turning a hose on this powder. This made all the talk about an immediate emergency ridiculous, and exposed in the open the rank hypocrisy of the claim that this was a war for democracy and freedom. In addition, there have been the ceaseless activities of such organizations as the America First Committee, the Keep America Out of War Committee, the National Council for the Prevention of War, and of such individuals as General Wood, Senator Wheeler, ex-Governor Phil LaFollette, President Hutchins of the University of Chicago, and President MacCracken of Vassar College, in opposing the interventionist campaign and working night and day for peace. It is impossible to exaggerate the courage and effectiveness of these anti-war forces in the face of such vicious smears and slanders as this country has not seen since the Civil War. But when all is said and done, it is the people, the great masses of the common people, who have saved America from the supreme disaster of taking up arms in this latest European embroilment. Through every known channel of information, the people have told their government that they would not support a war, and that if we went in, it would be with a public so hostile as to make any effective fighting impossible. *The people are against war!* In all the period of my lifetime, this is the most heartening fact that I have known.

II

Let it be recorded in this place, as a prophecy, that the campaign to get this country into the European war will be recorded by history as the wickedest that our history has ever known. It was based from the beginning upon the deliberate attempt to scare the people to death by proclaiming that America was in imminent danger of attack and destruction at the hands of Germany. An attempt to precipitate panic in a crowded theatre is a crime, but an attempt to spread panic through a nation is apparently something else again. The first step was to frighen us with the prospect of the bombing of our cities. The President led this cry with his unforgotten speech about bombing distances to New York, Washington, Omaha, Kansas City, and other large centers of population. Now comes the cool-headed offer of Lloyd's, London, to offer insurance against such bombing at odds of 1,000 to 1! The next step was to paint the picture of an invasion of this country by Hitler's army. After destroying England, and capturing the English fleet, the Fuehrer was to come over here and land his legions on our shores. Now comes an authoritative article on this question written by Lieutenant Colonel Thomas R. Phillips of the U. S. Army General Staff (who ought

to know his business!), and published in *Army Ordnance,* the official organ of the Army Ordnance Association, which declares that the American coast is "impregnable to invasion." The modern bombing plane, says Lieutenant Colonel Phillips, has made it possible for this country to insure not only its own territory from invasion, but "the impregnability of all North and South America." Colonel Phillips continues:

> Even if the United States had no harbor defenses, it would be impregnable to invasion. And this still would be true if our navy were inferior to that of an invading power. Land-based air power has made the United States impregnable to a sea-borne invasion.

The third step in driving this nation to panic was to declare that, even if not invaded, America would be economically ruined by a Hitler-dominated world. Now comes a report in the *Progressive* of a University of Chicago Round Table radio discussion in which Stuart Chase, noted author and economist, Peter Drucker, professor of economics at Sarah Lawrence College, and Neil H. Jacoby, associate professor of finance at the University of Chicago, agree together that the United States could "manage without any real problem" any economic effects of a Hitler victory in Europe. Whatever happens in Europe, these men declare that we "have nothing to fear economically." * * * I repeat!—that the campaign to get this country into war is the wickedest known to our history.

III

In such a world (see above!), we think it a good idea to have some principles, as a mariner has stars, to steer by. Principles may be described, in the words of Scripture, as "things which cannot be shaken." They are colors of the soul which do not change, chameleon-like, with every change of background. They are the qualities of men who make promises and keep them, set standards and abide by them. In the life of nations, as in the policies of statesmen, principles do not appear at all. Like snakes in Ireland, "they're ain't none!" One principle, pertinent today, is the principle that war is wrong. It makes no difference whether the war is fought by Britain to keep an empire, or by Germany to get an empire, it is wrong and can bring humanity no good. Another principle is that force is wicked, since it is the imposition of one's own will upon another's will by sheer weight of superior brute strength. It makes no difference whether America is using force to drive German submarines (Germany's weapons in this war) off the seas, or Germany is using force to drive American merchantmen and destroyers (America's weapons in this war) off the seas, force is in both cases damnable. Another principle is that cruelty is cruelty, and atrocities atrocities, no matter who is guilty of them. The German bombing of civilians in London is horrible—but so is the English bombing of civilians in Berlin. I can see as little reason for rejoicing in the latter as in the former. Another principle is that character remains what it is—that Stalin is the same butcher and tyrant today on our side that he was yesterday on the other side, and Soviet Russia the same totalitarian despotism fighting against the Nazis as fighting for them. Other principles are that a lie is a sin, even when spoken by a government—that a broken promise is a dishonor, even when made by a presidential candidate—that war is murder, even when done by a soldier in uniform.

It all can be summed up in the simple statement that war does not change or suspend the moral law, any more than a storm obliterates the stars. On the contrary, it is at the very time when the world tumbles into violence and chaos, that we need the moral law more than ever, lest all things go to pieces. So, to the best of our poor ability, and amid such weaknesses and failures as are inevitable to human flesh, let us stick by principles that we may not altogether perish.

IV

Leland Stowe has written a ferocious book—*No Other Road to Freedom.* All out for war! Fight the Germans until they're dead!! In the course of this book he writes ecstatically of the Finns—as why shouldn't he, since as a war correspondent he participated in the first war of that gallant and liberty-loving people against Soviet Russia (1939-'40)? His one cry is—O, why aren't we Americans like these splendid Finns! *But,* since Mr. Stowe wrote and published his book, the Finns have gone into a second war against Russia, and this time on the side of the Nazis. The Russians are now supposed to be fighting for the very liberty and democracy which the Finns love so much, but, being next door neighbors to the Russians, they can't exactly see it in that light. Poor Leland Stowe! His heroes now fighting side by side with the very Germans whom he would destroy! But Mr. Stowe is not alone in his confusion. The whirligigs in this war are endless, and who knows, or can know from day to day, where men and nations stand? Look at the record! In September, 1939, the Russians were on the side of the Nazis—and we had to hate and fear Russia as just one more of the totalitarian states. Now the Russians are fighting the Nazis—and we must love and help them as the champions of freedom. At the start of the war, France was the ally of Great Britain—and there were no words of praise too high for the gallant Frenchmen from Reynaud and Gamelin down, to say nothing of "the greatest army in Europe." Now France is fighting Britain in Syria and elsewhere—and there are no words too ugly for these "skunks" and blackguards. Iran, a few months ago, was a dastardly country, playing the dirty game of the Germans. Now, duly conquered by the English and Russians, Iran is an heroic country, ready to defend the Empire to the last drop of

ancient Persian blood. In the last presidential campaign, Wendell Willkie was nominated by the Republicans as the one great hope of the party to defeat Roosevelt and save America from the "third-term candidate." Now Mr. Willkie is the President's outstanding supporter in the foreign policy which he so bitterly denounced in his "campaign oratory." President Roosevelt, in this same campaign, solemnly promised the fathers and mothers of this country, "Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." Now, the campaign safely behind him, he has conscripted these boys, and is preparing them for war in Iceland and elsewhere. What whirligig next? Is America going to work out a successful agreement with Japan, and then shall we have to desert China? If Italy comes over, shall we have to love Mussolini? Will Britain stay put, if, when, and as it becomes her interest not to? What a world!

V

Some passing sidelights on America and the war! Five Hopi Indians have been arrested and imprisoned for resisting the draft. A correspondent in the New York *World-Telegram* says that "not even Nazi Germany has had the effrontery to ask its conquered peoples to fight for it, let alone demand that they fight for it." * * * James M. Boyd, writing in the New York *Herald-Tribune,* says: "As universal time is measured, Hitler will die within a split second; but if we continue to cater to the war system, it will probably outlast civilization." * * * The Moscow radio has called upon "all God-loving inhabitants of the occupied countries" to rise in defense of religious freedom. It charges the Nazi regime is "menacing the very existence of Christianity" and seeking the overthrow of "Christ the King." Let me see—when did I last hear of the pot calling the kettle black? * * * Governor Lehman, of New York, has suggested that the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," be stamped on all auto license plates next year. Great idea—especially for army trucks, tanks, and government cars generally! * * * Reverend Henry W. Pinkham, writing in the Newton (Mass.) *Transcript,* says: "He [President Roosevelt] loves to play with postage stamps and battleships and human destiny. Having failed to solve domestic problems in two terms, he grasped a third term in which to solve world problems." * * * Robert Sherwood's "There Shall Be No Night," announced for a return engagement in New York this fall, has been withdrawn. The Russian war has wrecked that interventionist play for good and all. * * * A poll of persons listed in *Who's Who in America* showed only 42.8 per cent in favor of our entering the war. Those against our entry were 57.2 per cent. * * * The National Council of Methodist Youth has passed a resolution advising President Roosevelt that it could not support him "if you lead us into war." * * * The Society of Friends still stands fast. The Iowa members at their 79th Annual Meeting reaffirmed their avowal that "all war is incompatible with the precepts of our Lord. No plea of necessity or policy can avail to release individuals or nations from allegiance to Him who has said, 'Love your enemies.'" * * * Testimony of Ernie Pyle, in the *World-Telegram* (New York), "All across the plains states, from the Rockies on east, I've been keeping my well-known ear to the well-known ground, doing a private Gallup survey on war sentiment. And almost everywhere the sentiment seems to be isolationist. Everywhere there seems to be a certain apathy toward the war, and some cynicism toward England." * * * H. N. Brailsford, liberal journalist of England, writing of America in the *New Statesman and Nation* (London), says: "For two years I had thought of this country as a factor in our own destiny, a factor which we hope to use for wider ends than its own." Yes, obviously—those "wider ends" being British ends. Wake up, America, and stump the propagandists.

VI

The death of Bishop Paul Jones on September 4th last brings back vivid recollections of the last World War. In that era of bitter struggle, Bishop Jones was one of the first and bravest of the pacifists among Christian ministers. There were not many of them! Dr. Ray H. Abrams, in his diligent inquiry for his book, *Preachers Present Arms,* could find less than one hundred. In Jones' own church, the Protestant Episcopal, there were in all the nation only seven (How times have changed! In this war, Paul Jones, still a pacifist, had the good company of 293 Episcopal clergymen, and among them one of the most distinguished of bishops). Of these seven pacifist heretics, Bishop Jones was of course the most conspicuous in his position as head of the diocese of Utah. He had earlier gotten into trouble as a Christian Socialist, but the real trouble came from his pacifism in wartime. It may be well to remember what happened to him! His resignation from his diocese was forced and accepted by the House of Bishops in 1918, under the influence of the war hysteria of that period. He had been guilty of saying, "As I love my country, I must protest against her doing what I would not do myself because it is contrary to our Lord's teaching." In a letter to the House of Bishops in 1917, he wrote: "I believe that the methods of international war are quite incompatible with the Christian principles of reconciliation and brotherhood, and that it is the duty of a bishop of the church, from his study of the word of God, to express himself on questions of righteousness, no matter what opinion may stand in the way." There was no place in the church for such a man at such a time, and so he had to go. Bishop Jones never complained at his tragic fate,

never blamed or condemned his persecutors. He simply went his quiet way, and to the end of his days did service as an apostle of the loving Christ. The *Churchman,* in an editorial notice, calls him "a valiant Christian crusader." The *Christian Century,* in a similar tribute, speaks of him as "a hero of the first World War." He was all this—and more. What was unique in him was his utter saintliness of character. I would name him first among all the pacifists I have ever known as realizing within his own soul the spirit which he commended to mankind as the way of life. His face had the radiance we read about in the old hagiological stories; his smile was a benediction; his companionship an ineffable blessing. He was as sweet of temper as he was heroic of stature. What a loss we have suffered in these times!

Jottings

Two ditchdiggers are digging a ditch not far from my home. They come to their work each morning in automobiles. This is the American standard of living! And this standard now threatens to be lost as the country wastes its substance in the riotous living of war.

I went to church, and heard the minister refer to certain preachers as "the talcum-powder boys whose gospel is guaranteed not to irritate the skin of sensitive parishioners." This one sentence was worth all the time I spent in the church that morning, and ten times what I had put in the collection plate.

Must one be a Quaker in order to be respectable as a pacifist? Why may not some of the rest of us hold the same views in regard to war that the Quakers hold, and for the same reasons, and be protected and honored therein? The answer is that the Quakers have more than three hundred years of steadfast witnessing behind them. They haven't been pacifists between wars only! When other pacifists are similarly faithful, they may be similarly regarded as sincere and honorable.

Germany invaded Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland in order to forestall the English and thus protect these countries from conquest. So Germany said! England invaded Iceland, Syria, and Iran, in order to forestall the Germans and thus protect these countries from conquest. So England said! It is evident that two can play at this game of war with equal efficiency and effrontery.

News of the World, published in England and quoted in the *Christian Pacifist* (London), has an idea for winning the war:

> It is impossible to estimate how many millions of pounds would be saved if every wearer of shoe leather would lengthen his or her stride by even a few inches. By striding an extra inch or two, leather would be saved and another nail put in the coffin of the cold-blooded Hun.

We have a better idea! Why not go barefoot? And why save leather only? Why not cloth? Perhaps the Nudists have the right idea, after all.

The question in Russia is not whether Germany is going to win the war, but at what cost. Of that question we know practically nothing, except that German figures are as fantastic one way as Russian figures are the other.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Lindbergh, Teller of Ghost Stories

GEORGE PERLMAN

I knew a young man who delighted in plying every gathering in which he found himself with one ghost story after another. He was an excellent raconteur, and he invariably sent the chills down the spines of his listeners. He gloried in frightening, especially the hysterical ones, until they were too disturbed to sleep that night. He especially loved to speak to those groups which had not asked him to do so.

But, strange as it may seem, whenever this young fellow attended a seance, it was he who would break up each meeting by irrelevant or facetious remarks. It was he, who by his innuendos, finally disrupted every spook invocation he attended. But at the next gathering of his friends his tales of horror were as terrifying and chilling as they ever had been.

After listening to and watching this young horror artist for a time we, his creeps-victims, finally came to the conclusion that his actual convictions were utterly opposed to the spirit hypothesis, but that this overgrown child had found a way of catching and holding the attention of his audiences. It was that, and that alone, after which he actually sought. Scaring audiences and breaking up seances, both, gave him that feeling of power which was his greatest quest in life.

One day some of us, who lived in the same building with this chap, and who had had enough of this purveyor of horror, sitting like an incubus on our credulous shoulders, decided to test his courage. (He had exorcised the spirit of a dead murderer who had haunted his father's summer home for almost forty years.)

We fixed a ticktack to the outside of his window. As kids we had had some great times scaring the wits out of the neighborhood miser. A ticktack is a small metal hammer attached to a bit of string; this, applied to an outside window, beats a rather ominous tattoo in the

middle of the night. We quickly fixed the ticktack to the outside of our friend's window and the cord was strung to the next room.

We waited for the ghost catcher. In the dead of the night we began to manipulate the mysterious gadget. After a few raps we heard a frightened voice hoarsely whisper, "Who is it?" "Ticktack" was the answer. Silence for a moment, then came the shaky voice a bit louder and huskier. "If there is a spirit present rap once for 'yes' and twice for 'no'!" We almost burst with restrained laughter at this bit of naivete. We rapped out messages—he asked for names and we gave plenty of them from Napoleon to his long-lost uncle. When our friend was on the verge of hysterics, we stopped. He had had enough.

The next morning he came down to breakfast as pale as a good ghost should be. He spoke to no one during the meal but after we had left the table he called us aside and said, "I wonder, fellows, if my room upstairs is haunted! Do you think such a thing is possible?"

All of his former erudition about psychic phenomena had gone out with the ticktack. He was scared! Jack, the Ghost Killer, face to face with an alleged wraith was as limp as a wet rag which had just been squeezed free of its dishwater. "Were ghosts possible?" He had, that night, met with the subject of ghosts for the first time. He was not asking for an audience now. His former insincerity, a blind for his attention-hunger, now, was turned to paralyzing fear in the face of his real lack of conviction on the subject of ghost chasing.

The Lindberghs, of today, are also seeking public attention, on a large scale, by their ghost stories. They are plying their listeners with "skeery" tales with only enough horror in them to catch the ears of those of passive or negative intelligence and of atrophied spirituality. The Lindberghs always exclude a small majority of Jews in their tales so that their willing listeners may not be too shocked at the disparagement between fact and fancy. It is not of the good Jews the Lindberghs speak, but it is of those Semitic ogres who wait in the dark to pounce on the innocent of this world.

The International Bankers! They are the villains who are turning humanity into serfs who will be at the mercy of their cruel Jewish masters. They wish to be the master race. The Jews are the capitalists! The Jews have all the gold in the world! The Jews are usurers!

But wait—other Lindberghs are saying that the Jews are all Communists and are waiting only for "Der Tag," the day, on which "comes the revolution" and they will take all the gold away from the capitalists and they and they alone will rule the world. They will have all the property and they will dole it out only as their communistic consciences will see fit.

Wrong again! Another group of Lindberghs say that the Jews are Pacifists! They would not fight for anything or anybody! They have coined the Hebrew word "Sholom" which means "Peace" and they will refuse to defend their country even from an invader!

"Stop in your tracks" say the latest Lindberghs. The Jews are Warmongers! They want no peace! They are blood-thirsty! They crave war and bloodshed! They are seeking to draw this country into this unholy conflict! They wish to destroy the peace of this world!

What a picture of clear, honest thinking! What sanity! What true Christian spirit there is manifested in the hearts and the minds of the Lindberghs who are demonstrating to the world that either they have completely lost their reason or that they are sinisterly talking through their hats for the sole purpose of retaining the attention of their constituents. Or, is it at all possible, that we are seeing in action, the dummies in the front window of Hitler, Inc.?

If any of these premises are true then I say to you, my Christian fellow citizens, the onslaught and insult are for and to you alone. The Jew has long worn the badge of suffering and he is ready to wear it again if he must but not without a struggle this time. This is one of the last places left on this globe in which humanity and freedom are the rights of our Democracy and, believe me, we will strive to the last ditch to keep these sacred rights. But even to have to reiterate our determination to defend ourselves from the onslaught of the Lindberghs is a state of affairs which our Christian friends must not permit to pass lightly. The insults of the Lindberghs are to the whole American nation. It is an affront to their intelligence, to their Democracy, and to their God.

Christian Americans! Can you not see that the Lindberghs are trying to find in your beings, reservoirs of hate which they can inflame for their own evil ends? Do you not see that they are trying to lead you into acts of unrighteousness so that in the confusion they may destroy your democratic rights and substitute the dictatorial form of government instead? Do you not see that behind their mask of high virtue is the ugly face of intolerance and that in intolerance lies your greatest spiritual danger?

The worst that can happen to us is that we can be physically destroyed, but will you stand idly by and see these agents of the dark forces rob you of your souls? "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the Soul."

We Jews have no apology to make. From the days of Columbus the blood of the Jew has mingled with that of your forefathers to make this glorious land what it is today. Our soldiers have died in the battles of Peace and in the battles of War in the construction and defense of this great nation. The past speaks for itself.

The Lindberghs are telling ghost stories today, insincere, sinister horror tales, but one day in the not too distant future they are going to meet some real spectres —they will see the ghost of an aroused public opinion which will castigate them for having attempted to bring those tyrannical devices to our own great land which heretofore have found welcome only in the dark night that is Europe.

They will see the spirit of righteous indignation, which shall cause their emasculated, cowardly selves to hide in the smallest corner, and they will know that resentment which will arise in the breasts of the decent citizens of America who will not condone the insults and treachery of the Lindberghs, the Nyes, and the Wheelers, toward that great and good man who sits sadly and bravely in the White House day and night, seeking for help and divine guidance for our own beloved America.

The Scientific Method in Solving Social Problems

ROGER PAYNE

In a series of lectures by Dr. Joseph K. Hart, former Associate in Social Sciences, Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Hart laid emphasis upon scientific method as the means of exploration, and defined scientific method as "the employment of hypotheses and the putting of them to the test of actual experience for verification, and allowing facts to confirm or refute them."

As an example of a hypothesis, I will quote Dr. Hart: "Newton had a hunch that the apple did not fall all the way to the earth, but that the earth came up to meet it." In order to verify this hypothesis, he worked out mathematically the "law of attraction," which is that all masses attract each other directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance.

Another example of a hypothesis, this time from the biological sciences, is that every form of life on this planet has evolved from a common origin. All the facts accumulated by the biologists, geologists, and other scientists have confirmed this hypothesis to the extent that it is now accepted as the fundamental generalization of the biological sciences.

When Dr. Hart went on to suggest that this method of "hypotheses" could be used in the social sciences, I began to sit up and to take notice, and, in fact, became very critical. I pointed out to him that there was no method of testing out hypotheses in the social sciences, since we could not put society, or a specimen of it, into a chemist's test tube or take it into a physical laboratory.

Dr. Hart replied that there were being accumulated in the social sciences an immense amount of factual material and some new technics by which hypotheses or suggestions for social change can be tested out and adopted or rejected.

He then pointed out that planned changes in social institutions take place as a result of some idea contributed by an individual. If such an idea is accepted by society an advance may be made. The idea contributed by the individual is a hypothesis. Society tests hypotheses by discussion and adoption, or rejection. Society thus is not only the subject of the test but also the ultimate arbiter of the hypothesis. This somewhat complicates the matter, but essentially the method is unchanged.

As a result of recent readings in the social sciences I am now convinced that the solution of social problems by the scientific method of hypotheses is the foundation of democracy. This becomes clear when we define democracy carefully. I have always insisted that democracy is essentially "a method of solving problems by the common intelligence of mankind." Dr. Hart defines it as "the spirit of intelligence and justice working at the task of making a desirable world."

The remainder of this article will be devoted to the two essentials of this testing of hypotheses by society: discussion and action.

In our Western civilization the first known attempt to solve problems by discussion was made by the ancient Greeks. In more recent times the New England town meeting stands out as one of the best examples of solving problems by discussion. Present-day forums are valuable.

Given a discussion group, what methods shall we use to come to an intelligent judgment upon problems that come up for discussion? Obviously we must use the scientific or common sense method. The scientist in solving a problem uses the experimental or "trial and error" method. In the physical sciences—chemistry and physics—this method can be used almost completely. In the biological sciences—botany and zoology—to a less extent. But when we come to the social sciences—sociology and economics—it must be used with great caution. On the one hand, we must not refuse to experiment, because such refusal lays the foundation for violent revolutionary changes. On the other hand, we must not make too many errors like trying to prohibit the traffic in liquor by law, or expecting to inaugurate a democratic society in Russia by establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat through a violent revolution. Both of these proposals could have been shown to be unsound if they had been subjected to a scientific criticism. The chief end of discussion then is to detect unsound hypotheses. In order to do this we must have some rules to guide our discussion. Instead of first laying down these rules, I will give some examples of unscientific methods and proposals and point out the rules as we proceed The examples that I will give fall naturally into three groups: (1) Nonsense, (2) utopias, and (3) panaceas.

In the first group I include such methods and proposals as are lacking in "common sense." As my first example I will give you something of a personal nature. I have spent much of the last twenty-five years traveling, and distributing a pamphlet entitled: "The Hobo Philosopher," on the cover of which appears the arresting question: "Why work six days a week, when you can make your living by working one?" Many people upon reading this question think that they are called upon to give an immediate answer to it. This they do without giving any thought to the matter and hence reveal the ideas lurking in their minds about work. I will quote a few of the more than one hundred answers that I have collected. I will divide them into two groups, because, strange to say, more than half of them have a religious background. Here are examples from the first group:

I work all the time because I like my work. My work is my play. I work for exercise or to keep healthy. Man was created to work. I work to keep out of mischief. Work makes life sweet. I work to keep from getting drunk. Others, on the contrary, tell me that they work only to earn the money to get a "jag." I work because if I did not, I would spend my life in idleness, in vice, or in jail.

To such answers as these I usually reply: Our lives are given us to live. Our work, the maintenance of our existence, ought to be a very small matter, about one day a week, and we should devote the other six days to the "art of living," to the development of our intellectual and spiritual faculties. Life may be a poem, a song, a dance, but it should never be slavery to work! When I feel unusually sarcastic I add: Mules, horses, asses, and machines were created to work.

The people who give a religious reason for spending all their lives in work, often bring it out by asking me a question: "You don't believe in the Bible then?" Upon asking: "Why not?" I am told that "the Bible

commands us to work six days a week," or that "God worked six days in creating the universe and that we ought to do the same." Others tell me that "we are commanded to earn our living by the sweat of our brow," or that "to work is to pray," or that "the Devil finds work for idle hands to do."

As a result of having this nonsense dinned into my ears for twenty-five years I have been compelled to recognize that America is the home of what I facetiously call, "the religion of work." Further, that this religion has one God, "the almighty dollar" and one commandment: "Six days shalt thou labor!"

The aim of religion, as I understand it, should be to direct men's minds toward the spiritual, ethical, and aesthetic values of life and away from material things. That misquotations from the Bible should be used to justify the spending of all our lives in work, seems to me to be an utter travesty on religion and should be condemned by all truly religious persons!

These answers that I have quoted might be dismissed from our minds as unadulterated nonsense, but I want to use them to bring out an important rule for common sense thinking. To do this I must present two short newspaper quotations. The first is from a review of my book, *Why Work? Or the Coming Age of Leisure and Plenty,* written by a Mr. Benjamin de Casseres, who is the writer of a column called "The March of Events," appearing in the nation-wide Hearst newspapers. Mr. de Casseres stated very fairly in his first paragraph that: "In a highly readable and literate book, Mr. Payne contends that each of us need work only one day a week and do as we please the other six." But then he goes on to say:

> The whole theory of Mr. Payne falls to pieces, because his theory that man doesn't want to work is all wrong. . . . The average man likes work. He's miserable, when he isn't working. And as to leisure, nothing bores quicker. It isn't leisure that the bulk of mankind craves, but more work—and plenty of it.

The other quotation is from a speech made by a Mr. J. F. Edgerton at the time when he was the president of the National Association of Manufacturers. This is the organization that puts up gigantic posters all over the country, telling the workers what a paradise they have here in America, according to the point of view of the N. A. M. He said:

> "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," so reads the fourth of the great commandments, and for sixty centuries it has been accepted as the divinely prescribed standard of economic effort. All through the Great Book the importance and sacredness of work are emphasized as life's first continuing obligation.

What is the motive of these two quotations? Evidently propaganda! So obviously so that it is hardly necessary to subject them to the acid test of propaganda, which is to ask the question: Who benefits from these statements? Evidently Mr. Hearst and his millionaire friends of the National Association of Manufacturers, who own our newspapers and industries and who want to employ men to work for the lowest wages and for the longest hours possible, in order to accumulate more millions of dollars. These working people, whose answers I read to you, are evidently repeating this propaganda. They read this sort of thing daily in their newspapers, and use it to rationalize spending all their lives in work. It lulls them to sleep, whereas if they would only wake up and do a little problem-solving thinking, they would find out that long hours of labor are no longer necessary.

This, then, is the first rule for logical thinking—avoid propaganda! By this I mean of course untruthful and misleading statements put out by special interests for their own benefit. Search it out and avoid it as you would "poison ivy" in the woods.

My next example deals with the subject of warfare. Some time ago I was discussing this subject with some friends. One gentleman present told us that wars would never be abolished until the second coming of Christ; that he knew this because he read his Bible every day; and that the coming of Hitler and the present war in Europe were foretold in his Bible. I am afraid that I do not read the same Bible as he does. I read my Bible through from "kiver to kiver" once, when I was a boy, and found no reference to Adolf Hitler in it. A little later, a good lady told us that the way to end war was to "think peace." She was apparently a follower of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, or perhaps Father Divine.

Obviously warfare can never be abolished by simply thinking peace, or by the repetition of pious platitudes such as "peace on earth and good will toward men." Such ideas show a lack of common sense! To discover the method of abolishing warfare involves a little problem-solving thinking. We must first find out why warfare exists and then state the solution in the form of a hypothesis. Fundamentally warfare exists because all relations between nations are based upon might instead of right, upon force instead of justice. In international relations anarchy prevails instead of law and order.

In ancient times if you and I had a quarrel we would fight it out. But fighting between individuals has now been abolished by: (1) developing national systems of laws dealing with personal relations, (2) establishing courts of law to settle disputes between individuals, and (3) employing officials and a police force to see that the decisions of the courts are carried out and peace maintained.

Similarly, wars between nations will only be abolished when we establish: (1) A world parliament to codify international law, (2) a world court to settle disputes between nations, and (3) a world police force to see that the decisions of the court are carried out and world peace maintained.

This is the scientific or common sense method of abolishing warfare! The second rule for logical thinking therefore is that we must not allow our emotions, opinions, prejudices or beliefs, whether religious or otherwise, to influence our thinking.

My final examples under this heading will be the proposals of the people whom we frequently call "money cranks." They think that our economic troubles arise from something wrong with our currency, usually that there is not enough money in circulation.

A good example of this nonsense was the experiment that was tried in Alberta, Canada, under the name of "social credit." Under this plan twenty-five dollars a month was given to every adult in the form of a paper currency, upon each dollar of which a two-cent stamp had to be placed every week. Naturally no one would accept this currency for more than the value of the stamps placed upon it.

Notwithstanding this failure, a similar plan was initiated in California with the savory title of "Ham and Eggs." It was proposed to give a pension to the aged in a similar currency. It was defeated only by a small majority.

Such plans are only variations of the old foolishness of trying to lift oneself by pulling on one's boot straps. The problem of old age pensions or that of increasing the general economic welfare will never be solved by

manipulating the currency, but by producing more goods and services and devising methods to distribute them to the desired beneficiaries. This is the scientific or common sense method.

The second group includes the utopias. Mankind has always been addicted to "wishful thinking." All down the ages men have used myths, fairy tales, and travel romances, to envision the things that were missing in their daily lives. Utopian dreams go further than just wishful thinking, because they oppose existing institutions and seek to disintegrate them by criticism. They have not only educational value, but often move the readers to action. I believe that Bellamy's books, *Looking Backward* and *Equality,* have done more educationally for socialism in America than all the efforts of the various socialist organizations combined. The weakness of utopias is that they seek change without any attempt to diagnose the actual conditions and develop a logical remedy. They therefore have no problem-solving value.

Many of the plans that are being suggested for solving social problems are classed as utopian not because they propose the founding of utopias, but because they are impracticable. I will refer to two of them:

The late Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, had an idea which he called "The Share the Wealth Plan." His suggestion was to confiscate all fortunes above four million dollars and distribute the proceeds as a patrimony to every family in the form of a home or shares in corporations to the value of $5,000. He sensed that something needed to be shared more equally, but failed to understand that it was the annual income of the nation and not the accumulated wealth. In view of the fact that his figures were mathematically unsound, his plan might be classed as nonsense, but we will give him the benefit of the doubt and call it utopian.

The other plan is that known as "Technocracy." The members of this group have done an excellent job of education by showing the possibility of producing plenty to supply the needs of all with comparatively little labor. To distribute this plenty they propose to substitute energy units in the measurement and pricing of goods and services and to give to every family an equal purchasing power in energy units, equivalent to at least $5,000 yearly. Obviously this could be done just as well with the existing currency until the time when production would become so plentiful that abundance would be available for all and distribution could be made freely, to each according to his need. The introduction of this unnecessary complexity makes the plan impractical and utopian.

In the third group are the panaceas, the best example of which is the cure-all patent medicine. They are advertised to cure every affliction of the human body, from ingrowing toe nails to bald heads, but usually have no curative value whatever. The only ones that approach the virtues claimed for them are the "tonics" or "bitters" containing a high percentage of alcohol, which are frequently advertised "to open up wonderful visions of the future to downcast, weary-laden souls, depressed in spirit and in body" or "to put dash into tired, weary, sick and run-down men." This they will no doubt do, if taken in sufficient quantity.

Some of you may be surprised when I give as my first example of a panacea the "Single Tax" proposition of Henry George. It is however clearly of this nature. In his book, *Progress and Poverty,* Henry George advocates the taxation of land values up to their rental value as a remedy for poverty and all the other ills of our economic system. Such a tax might lighten the burden of other forms of taxation or enable more social benefits to be distributed, but it would solve none of the problems that are troubling us today. The reason being that Henry George's economics is that of an agrarian society, out of which stage America had passed before *Progress and Poverty* was written.

Another example of a panacea is the "Townsend Old Age Pension Plan." Dr. Townsend's original plan was to give to all those above sixty years of age a pension of $200 a month. The amount necessary to pay this, about twenty-four billion dollars, being collected by a two per cent turn-over tax. Although this plan was shown to be impractical and mathematically unsound, it was found to have a great emotional appeal to the old people. Dr. Townsend played up this emotional appeal to the limit and further argued that the increased purchasing power claimed for his plan would bring prosperity to everybody. His plan thus became an obvious panacea without any real value.

There is one other point that I want to make under this heading, and that is the tendency of some people, who have a sound plan or hypothesis for a certain purpose, to become so obsessed by it that they see in it a panacea for all our ills. Socialists, for instance, often make this mistake. Socialism is the logical solution of the general economic problem that we face today. When, however, we are considering some particular economic problem, such as poverty or unemployment, or some social problem such as warfare or crime, to propose as the only solution socialism, or any other solution of a general nature, is illogical. It is of course delightfully simple to have one solution for all our problems, but that is neither logic nor common sense. The rule here is that the appropriate solution of a particular problem must be of a particular nature, and that of a general problem, of a general nature.

Having concluded, as a result of some preliminary discussion, that a particular hypothesis is a possible solution of some social problem, how then can we get society to act upon it? In our complex society of today, democracies have developed the representative form of government for accepting or rejecting proposed solutions of social problems. To obtain a decision upon a hypothesis it is usually necessary to have it adopted by one of the existing political parties or to organize a new party for that purpose. This is a very long and difficult process, hence we need new techniques by which our electoral system can be made more quickly available for the solution of social problems. One of these might be upon the lines of initiative and referendum conducted by mail and radio. Another is to work out a method by which, in our popular elections, we can vote upon hypothetical issues as well as upon the election of representatives. The British parliamentary system attains more closely to this ideal.

One very important point in regard to action! Today, there are few educated persons who would dispute the proposition that production for use instead of for profit is the logical way to distribute the plenty that modern machinery offers. Education and organization for this purpose has been carried on for about one hundred years by socialist groups. In some countries socialist parties have been in control of the governments. Yet in no case have they used their opportunity to inaugurate a socialist society. Why this failure of action?

The fundamental answer to this question is to be found in the text books on sociology. It may be summarized in one sentence: The motivation of all social action is not intellect, but feeling. Lester F. Ward in his *Dynamic Sociology* says:

> Those persons who . . . are looking forward to the time when intellect and reason will assume control of society, dethroning passion and emotion, are doomed to disappointment, not only in their own time, but forever. Feeling alone can drive on the social train for weal or woe.

He then goes on to extend this statement by saying very forcibly:

> Not only has the world thus far been ruled by passion and not by intellect, but the true rulers of the world have had to be, in order to win that distinction, not merely enthusiasts and fanatics, but in the majority of cases insane persons. . . . Instead of having been guided and impelled by intellect and reason throughout all the years of history, we have been ruled and swayed by the passions of epileptics and monomaniacs.

These quotations were written nearly sixty years ago, but we do not have to go back to history to support them. Every successful movement of the last sixty years has been led by men of strong passions; men who have known how to influence people to action by working upon their feelings and emotions. Unsuccessful movements have lacked this personal emotional appeal!

The best example today of such a man and such a well-led movement is Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist Party in Germany. Hitler is clearly a fanatic whose emotional nature has been powerful enough to sway the mass of the German people. That he is insane I doubt, although I have heard such a statement many times. Mussolini and Lenin both had something of the same power. The only time that the Socialist party in America made any real progress was when it was led by a man with emotional appeal: Eugene V. Debs.

There are many men in the world who have this power of appeal. Any movement that expects to be successful in putting its ideas over must train such men and give them the opportunity to express themselves, as was done by the earlier supporters of Hitler. This is the part that must be played by intellect in any movement. The success of National Socialism in Germany was not only due to the existence of a fanatical leader, but more to the fact that it could enlist in its service the best brains that could be found in the country that has the highest scientific development in the world.

It should now be clear that two things are necessary to arouse society to action. First, an appeal to the emotions and the passions. Second, the intelligent guidance of this appeal by men who have the necessary knowledge of applied sociology, or, as it is now sometimes called "social engineering."

Let me summarize some of the general rules to be drawn from what I have said: (1) Avoid being influenced by propaganda; (2) emotions, opinions, prejudices or beliefs, whether religious or otherwise, must play no part in our thinking; (3) our thinking must be concrete and objective, not abstract or subjective. Avoid superficial generalizations, stereotyped formulae and hackneyed sayings; (4) all solutions must be based on facts. When these are not within our personal knowledge, we must accept the best scientific authorities. Beware however of "pseudo-scientists"; (5) all solutions must be logical. The relation of cause and effect must be rigidly observed. Particular problems must have particular, not general, solutions; (6) all solutions in which calculations are involved must be mathematically sound; (7) all solutions that are nonsensical, utopian, or of the nature of panaceas must be rejected; (8) all solutions that are in conflict with the generalizations of the sciences must be rejected; (9) all solutions of problems of a broad nature, such as a change of a whole economic order or political system must be in line with the trend of social evolution, and with a long time historic perspective; and (10) action upon a solution which discussion has led us to believe to be correct can only be obtained by an appeal to the emotions. Such an appeal must be guided by scientific knowledge and wisdom.

Keep these general rules in mind, use them in forming judgments upon the many plans for solving social problems that are brought before us, and we shall not make many mistakes in distinguishing those plans that are scientific and worthy of our approval from those that are unscientific and worthy only of our condemnation.

From Share Cropper to Farmer

EDGAR H. WEBSTER

I met Andrew, it may have been in 1935. He was one of a family that after the World War escaped from the Black Belt, and had come to Baldwin County, having heard that there was plenty of work in southern Alabama. He and his brothers and sisters escaped also the common schools of the county. This is true of the boys. The girls had some hang at books. When I met him he had secured an acre more or less of land on which he had built a shack. And his plot was fenced. I presume that this was the outcome of a successful year as a cotton share cropper.

I met Ed., his brother, before I met Andrew. That was in 1934. That year he cleared as a share cropper where he furnished only labor a hundred dollars. He bought a lot of land, said to be about two acres but which proved to be much larger. He purchased this land for $75.00, paying $50.00 down and giving a mortgage for the balance. With the remainder he cut trees into timber, carried it to the saw mill where it was cut into lumber on halves. He erected a two-room frame house as a home for his growing family. Will, another brother, had never gotten beyond the share cropper or renter stage.

In addition to their small holdings, Andrew and Ed. rented land, raised the potatoes, the cucumbers, and the cotton for the cash crops with as much success as the neighboring farmers. Each got hold of a mule, also a cow, and some hogs. Beside their own garden and the work on their own small farms, they worked as day laborers on the plantations of their neighbors.

This is the base of the story that really begins in 1938. The year 1937 had been a rather satisfactory one; 1938 was a poor year not only for these men, but for their white neighbors, operating on a larger scale. I recall one farm-renter who made $800 on potatoes in the spring of 1937 and lost his investment

in the spring of 1938. Despite the failure of the "cash" crops, the spring gardens helped out the situation, and the fodder crops were perhaps the most successful item of the year.

In the fall of 1938, the Aluminum Company began the construction of its Mobile plant. The three brothers and some others secured jobs with the plant. They were paid $14 per week. The three with others secured an automobile and by pooling the cost of gas and oil, etc., were able to get across the bay cheaply. These wages were a revelation to the men. Andrew at once bought another acre of land for which he paid. On the strength of his job, he was able to secure lumber "on time" and put up a small frame house, about nineteen feet square. Ed. rented thirty acres of land, twenty being cleared, and also put up a small frame house, using his old shack as a barn. Will's wages were spent in the hospitalization of his wife. The local physician sent the wife to a Mobile hospital, where a white surgeon removed a large tumor, two small ones, and also an ovary. The charge was $50. The patient spent six weeks in the hospital, at a charge of $3 per day, a bill of about $125. This was followed by a series of *shots* for the blood, perhaps a fortnight apart. The cost of getting to Mobile and the charge per shot were about $8. Will paid the surgical bill and the hospitalization in large part. Perhaps it is still unpaid, as well as the charge for the *shots* in part.

The last week of November, 1938, was bitterly cold in this region. The Mobile weather bureau reports from November 23 to December 1 listed 32, 36, 29, 37, 31, 25, 28, 31, 35, 38 degrees. The two houses referred to above were unfinished, doors unhung, and chimneys only begun. Just how this problem due to nine days of cold was met, the writer does not know. But Will had a house on his rented land, and there were the neighbors.

But not long after, the work which this group could do on the foundation of the plant was finished, and the men were "laid off" to be recalled later if needed. They have not been "needed." The Aluminum Company will never know the tragedy of thus being "laid off." With their wages cut off, their debts still to be met, and no funds for the spring "money crop" of potatoes, these men were in an unhappy situation. In a way they have not thoroughly recovered themselves in the last two years.

In 1939 each of the three men rented again the lands of the previous year. By working for the planters in the region, they planted their gardens, bought fertilizer and cotton seed, looking again to cotton as the "money crop" and to field corn and soybeans and peanuts for the fodder crops. They took up their cotton allotments, which in the case of Cene (who now enters the history) was five acres. The allotments of the others were not markedly different. The net results for each of the four were: Will, $23.71, Cene, $15.30, Ed., $20.00 and Andrew, $15.00. In addition they received subsidy checks: Will, $17.01, Cene, $11.14, Ed., $18.30, Andrew not reported. This makes the totals: Will, $35.72, Cene, $26.44, Ed., $38.30. To these amounts should be added the soil-conservation checks.

Early in 1940 Andrew and Ed. got on the WPA. The WPA pays 27 cents per hour for 120 hours per month. When working full time the workers get $8.70 per week, or twice that per fortnight, the checks coming each two weeks. This seems to be arranged so that each man has about half time to work his garden or a money crop. But the working days depend upon the weather, and there are many days when there can be no work for the workers. And the checks are sometimes small. Will and Cene were not called to the WPA. Andrew, Will, and Ed. were able to mortgage their mules and their fall crops for cotton. Fortunately perhaps they could not mortgage for sufficient funds for potatoes and corn. Baldwin County planted 20,000 acres in potatoes in 1940, and the weather was against the planters. The price per 100 lbs. averaged rather high but the yield was not large, and there were hundreds of acres that were not picked. The season was no better for cotton than for potatoes. In the language of a white farmer whose crop was financed for him, "1940 was one of the poor years." And the results for these men who were renting were no better than for many others. The results were disappointing: Andrew, $10.23, Will, $14.93, Cene, $15.73, Ed., $17.53. The mortgages were due November 1, and soon after the mortgagee threatened to foreclose. Andrew and Ed. made a payment from their WPA checks and pledged their soil-conservation checks for the balances, by February 1. The mortgagee said that these men were not unique. Even a good many of the white farmers had been caught in the same way.

Beside the unfavorable spring weather, 1940 was hard on Ed. and Will. In the midst of the spring work Ed. lost his mule, he says from old age; and Will lost his, perhaps from a complication of kidney and bladder trouble. Later in the year Will lost a young horse from some obscure trouble. Late in November the two brothers were called to Pensacola to see a sick sister. A borrowed car was wrecked by a driver who was breaking all the rules of bridge driving. The father and Ed's wife required ten stitches in the head at a cost of $10. Will had three ribs broken, and a skull fracture as revealed by an X-ray over the left ear and affecting the optic nerve. The owner of the car depended upon it to carry him to his daily work in Mobile. So another 1930 Chevrolet had to be found. During the year Will had a great deal of family sickness, being himself "out of the fight" for some weeks.

The three men, and especially Ed. and Will, entered 1941 with serious handicaps. But they have the same optimism that marks Baldwin County, which having made a "poor" success of 20,000 acres of potatoes in 1940, ploughed 22,000 acres for 1941. The problem of these men is to be financed, perhaps by the Farm Security Administration. The FSA is operating in Baldwin County as "The Rural Rehabilitation Division" which makes family loans to low-income farmers who can fit into its scheme and cannot get their justifiable credit from any other lending agency.

For some time I have noticed upon the window of a lawyer's office the letters HOLC (Home Owners Loan Corporation). Inquiry elicited the fact that he is a "Contract Sales and Management Broker" for the cases where the government has foreclosed on the loan. He sells or rents or keeps up repairs on such lands. He has in three years handled some eighteen pieces of land. This means, as I understand it, that eighteen farmers have lost their farms through the HOLC and become either renters or day laborers or have found work in some form of industry in the city. At least they have lost their status as independent farmers.

I do not know that any of these cases are Negroes. But I do know that the Negroes are hesitant about approaching the government through the Rural Reha-

bilitation Division of the FSA. I suspect that they know of cases where the government has foreclosed. Under such foreclosures, Andrew and Ed. would lose their land, their home, their stock, and their crop. Will would lose his stock and crops. The agent for fertilizer and seed, knowing the situation and the small cotton crop and also being aware of the Conservation checks, can extend the time. Even the local banks do not wish to gather too large an amount of foreclosed mortgages and can arrange helpful measures. But the government is not, and perhaps cannot be, merciful.

There is a factor in the situation that is significant. These farmers, white and colored, agree to limit their acreage and to enter the soil conservation project and so are in touch with the government and have their names on mailing lists to receive circulars and circular letters from the county agent or from the county administrative assistant of the AAA. These farmers, I have in mind those who are working up out of the share cropping or renting class into small farmers, are in touch with the officials and, it may be, consult them. The attitude of the county officials on these government projects is most sympathetic. And right here there is no color. Twice at least and perhaps oftener letters have been received inviting them to vote on policies. One read as follows:

> Dear Cotton Producer:
>
> December 7 is your opportunity to exercise your democratic privilege of voting to decide whether you want to continue cotton marketing quotas in 1941 as in 1938, 1939, and 1940.

At one polling place more Negroes voted than white.

Just how 1941 will turn out for these three men is debatable. But whatever they do, they started 1941 handicapped at least by the debts incurred by the poor crop of 1940.

World Constitutional Convention

HERBERT ARTHUR STURGES

Stronger than the will of the victors to impose an unequal peace after the present war is the will of the world for a just peace that will endure. Therefore, instead of a peace conference at the end of the war, I suggest a World Constitutional Convention.

In the history of the United States may be found useful examples for planning the World Federal Government. We know that the federal government of the United States is not a power ruling the states. In the same way, the World Federal Government should not rule, but serve: as a meeting place where representatives of all interests in the world may come together to discuss and to solve the problems of the world, helping to satisfy the needs of the people of all the world.

In the process of formation of our own federation, a vital and necessary step was the Constitutional Convention. Here met the leaders of each section of the country; here they proposed forms of organization for the Union of the States, reserving broad powers of local control to the States, giving a few important powers and functions to the central government.

Instead of a Peace Conference at the end of the present war, we should have a World Constitutional Convention. Stronger than the will of the victors for an imposed peace, keeping for themselves the spoils of victory, forcing upon the vanquished harsh terms of poverty and unremitting toil, is the will of the world for a real lasting peace of world reorganization. Yes, the will of the world is for a just peace, the only kind of peace which can endure. But the will of the world for a just and lasting peace must be expressed in effective action. This means that instead of a Peace Conference, dominated by conquerors, imposing their selfish demands on the conquered, we must have a meeting of all world interests; coming together not as victors and vanquished, but as equals; expressing the will of the world for a reasonable and permanent system for solving international problems. And this expression of the will of the world will be most effective in the form of a World Constitutional Convention at the end of the present world war.

One tremendous advantage of this plan is to hasten an armistice among the fighting countries. If all realize that the collective world will is for a "peace without victory" and that a World Constitutional Convention will be held, where all world interests will meet on a basis of fair and equal representation, no fighting nation need fear or hesitate to lay down its arms. And what a glorious blessing that armistice will be to everyone!

We should remember that there are many great interests in the world today which are not identified with national interests. In the World Constitutional Convention and in the World Federal Government, place must be made for the representation of these interests. For example, the world interests of science should be represented. Each great department of science, such as chemistry, biology, medicine, sociology, economics, and many others should have representation. Representatives of science will make many useful contributions to the discussion and solution of the problems of world organization.

Industry needs representation: of labor, of management, and of technology. Likewise agriculture, transportation, finance; education, art, literature; women, children, young people, parents; and many others. Each such interest group should be fully and ably represented in the World Constitutional Convention and in the World Federal Government. Each such group has needs whose satisfaction depends in part on the correct arrangement of world processes; and each has special technical skills useful in world-planning and reconstruction.

To be sure, there are also very important national interests: need of access to raw materials, need of security in trade with other nations, need of freedom and of opportunity. Representatives of the nations may well form a large part of the total representation in the World Constitutional Convention and in the World Federal Government; but not such a large part as to exclude or unduly subordinate the representation of the above mentioned world-wide, non-national interests, like religion, education, and law.

To avoid the appearance or actuality of undue influ-

ence by any one nation or any one continent, the World Constitutional Convention should not meet permanently in one place. Let it meet first, say, in Africa, then in Asia, then in Europe, and last in Central America. The capital of the World Federal Government also should move from place to place. If the world capital were fixed in Japan, the other nations would have a right to be jealous, and to fear undue influence of Japanese interests. Similarly if the world capital were located once and for all time in Australia, in North America, or in Europe. Let it remain for a year in one continent, then go to another, staying in turn in each one. To set a good example, the World Constitutional Convention should meet, say for two or three months, in each continent in turn.

Its task is to plan for World Representative Government, a parliament for the discussion and solution of problems of common world-wide interest; as well as for the expression of conflicting interests which above all need to be resolved into reasonable compromise plans and policies of adjustment. World executive and judicial functions may well be performed by suitably selected committees of a world legislature fully and fairly representative of all interest groups.

Meetings of the World Constitutional Convention, and of the World Federal Government should be accompanied by great annual international games. Young people from all over the world should assemble for discussion of world affairs, and for sports and contests of athletic skill. These world games will help to draw and focus world attention on the great constructive enterprise of world political and economic organization.

Everyday Life in Norway

KURT D. SINGER

Norway, though occupied by the Nazis, continues to wage war, partly outside of the country, but mostly within the country itself. There is an increasing number of reports that tell demonstrations take place every day against the Quisling regime. Sabotage is the order of the day. It is not by chance that great rocks fall in four different places at the same time along Norway's most important railway line (Oslo-Bergen) and that this line is bombarded a few days later by the RAF. The bitterness of the people is directed toward the Norwegian Nazis, who now have organized an SA and an SS stormtrooper of their own under the "Hirdman," to a far greater extent than toward the Germans, who are regarded as enemies, as conquerors. The Norwegian traitors around Quisling have attracted all the popular anger and indignation. They are attacked and beaten in the streets; acts of violence are arranged and executed by an illegal organization. Thus a number of leading Norwegian Nazis have been found in one of the fjords, murdered. One of the best known is the skating champion Michael Staksrud.

From the official Norwegian side it is declared, now as from the beginning, that there is no organized opposition—that the Norwegian and German Nazis are fought spontaneously and without any central leadership.

The regimentation and the censorship of the press created new forms of illegal information. The illegal movement in the country published pamphlets among other things, which contain nothing but a page from the handbook of Norwegian conversation, prepared for the German troops of occupation in Norway. In it can be found the following questions, of cardinal importance for the Nazis, which every German soldier must learn by heart: "Are you the mayor (pastor, teacher)?" "Open all closets (boxes)." "Where is the money-box?" "How many Kronen are in it?" "Write down the number here." "Have you any more money?" "I confiscate the money."

The demonstrations, which recur regularly, have assumed on occasion serious forms. From Bergen we hear that about 10,000 Norwegians in front of the Assembly Hall sang the King's song and the National Anthem, when Quisling held a meeting. He was greeted with cries of "shame" and "down with him," and many cries of "Long live King Haakon" were heard. Even the German armed police, which was present, could not restore order; and wild rioting developed between the German police and the Norwegian Nazis on the one hand, and the crowd of people on the other.

After it was learned that the Norwegian police took no part in this tumult in Bergen, the Minister of Police Jonas Lie (now popularly called Judas Lie) proclaimed that police officers must be members of the Quisling Nazi Party and use the Nazi greeting "Heil Hitler." The Norwegian Legation policeman in Oslo resigned.

Nazifying is now being carried on systematically. Quisling went to Berlin and got from Hitler authority to employ terrorizing means against his own countrymen who will not submit to him. At that the highest court of justice resigned and was replaced by a "People's Court." The new German military judges of course have a far from complete knowledge of the Norwegian language. The first sentences of from one to two years in prison for listening to the Boston radio station, that has a new policy of news in Norwegian, and to London have already been handed down.

The death penalty, which had been banned in Norway, was introduced again and has already been put into effect in the case of persons who had contact with the royal family and with the English government.

Despite all these measures, Quisling is not sure of the Norwegian police and has issued the following decree:

> Police Order. Within the prescribed districts the Norwegian police has only to attend to traffic duties. Interference with members of the Nasjonal Samling (Quisling Party) or of the Hirdman organization is forbidden to all agents of the Norwegian police. The German Safety Police has been given an enlarged patrol duty, strengthened by civilian agents. The Norwegian policemen must obey their directions absolutely. A police constable that takes the side of the demonstrators can expect the most severe punishment.

This edict put all power in the hands of the Norwegian Nazis.

The Nazi Governor Torboven, who likewise can hardly speak Norwegian, took a several weeks' trip of inspection throughout the country, going as far as the

North Cape, intending to replace all local authorities and administration with the Nazis. Each local government was to be given complete authority. It turned out that neither Quisling nor the German Nazis could find Norwegians who were willing to be at the disposal of the new regime. The reorganization of the municipalities, accustomed to governing themselves, was a fiasco. It is interesting that the Nazis themselves must admit the resistance of the Norwegian people. In the newspaper of the "Hirmanen" is the following account:

> Twenty-eight men of the Oslo Hirden stormtrooper were with the "Fuehrer" (Quisling) in Ostvolt. When we marched, the people began to whistle; but when we halted, they were quiet again. A stinkbomb exploded not far from the Assembly Hall. . . . We marched through a few streets . . . a crowd demonstrated and some of their anti-Nazi placards were taken from them. Four persons were arrested, we also seized one person who was distributing anti-Nazi badges.

Quisling has put an end to the physician's right to silence—which has evoked strong resentment, that is surpassed only by the bitterness at transferring of Norwegian workers, especially of women, to Germany.

While the people are subject to severe restrictions, the once-impoverished Quisling has bought himself one of the finest villas in Oslo at $100,000. But Norwegian hotelmen and restaurant-keepers report that all guests leave the spot as soon as he and his staff appear. Quisling stands alone and rules with Hitler's bayonets.

The Study Table

Christianity on the Witness Stand

CHRISTIANITY CROSS-EXAMINED. *By William Floyd. New York: The Arbitrator Press. 273 pp.*

The author of the book, an admired associate, the Editor of the *Arbitrator,* knows his Bible from Alpha to Omega, or rather from "Genesis" to "Revelation." In the best Ingersollian style, he here exposes the Bible as the inspired Word of God, and lays bare the absurdities of this doctrinal claim. By the device of question and answer in the style of cross-examination, sustained through a series of chapters which take up one by one the books of the Old Testament and the New, he makes plain the inconsistencies, the contradictions, the scientific inaccuracies, the primitive immoralities and barbarities which cumber the Christian scriptures, which are a library rather than a book and were written centuries before the dawn of modern knowledge. From this point of view, Mr. Floyd's book is as devastating as it is unanswerable. It is a kind of last word in the field of unbelief.

There are many things to be said about this book, of which in this limited space I somewhat arbitrarily choose three:

(1). Mr. Floyd claims to be questioning "a modernist minister." As a matter of fact, he is really questioning a fundamentalist. No modernist of whom I know would for a single moment take the position imposed upon his victim by the questioning author—who by the way, in the end permits himself to be placed upon the grill! Only the thoroughgoing and unenlightened orthodox would accept the Bible in the whole-cloth fashion here depicted, and thus expose himself to this awful disclosure of mingled ignorance and superstition. Incidentally, also, it is not Christianity which is here cross-examined, but a peculiarly benighted brand of Christian dogmatism.

(2). If not really concerned with the modernist in these pages, Mr. Floyd has done a superb job in exposing the failure of the modernist to "come clean," so to speak, on this Bible question. The typical modernist is more or less of a compromiser. He reaches out to and grasps the new scientific and historical approach to the Bible, while never leaving hold of the old superstitious doctrines or viewpoints of special inspiration. This leads to confusion, and the confusion is ferociously exploited in this volume. After all, there is no half-way between the position of the fundamentalist at the one end, and that of the liberal or humanist at the other. Mr. Floyd has done us all a great service in making this plain.

(3). But, as my last point, Mr. Floyd's own humanistic position is not adequately set forth. What I miss in this book is the historical approach to the Bible. Of course, for his own purposes, Mr. Floyd is quite justified in taking the approach of the dogmatist whom he is undertaking to discredit. But along with this should go an adequate statement of what the Bible really is, how it was produced, and the periods of civilization which it reflects. Also, there should be due recognition of those spiritual splendors of the book which rank it first among the great religious literatures of the world. Such treatment as that given to the "Psalms," "Job," "Isaiah," "Jeremiah," "Amos," "Hosea," the Gospels, and certain of the Epistles seems to me to be as bad on the one side as the whole orthodox treatment of the Bible on the other.

Nevertheless, in its own field, which is all too limited, Mr. Floyd's book is superbly done. Incidentally, it is amusing and informing reading.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

Mr. Jobman Replies

To UNITY:

It is a sad commentary to make the unhappy discovery that one can be so woefully misunderstood, as the echo of my communication is revealed in the correspondence columns of UNITY, dated September, 1941. Now I can grasp more fully the meaning of the lament in the Book of Job! But a faithful devotion to the noble dynamics of UNITY and a high regard for its family of readers bid to correct the unhappy impressions gathered by some of your correspondents who, by the way, have failed even to mention or disprove the very theme of my communication, namely—that a Nazi peace and a Fascist-controlled world would be the greatest menace (1) to "the soul of honor, of truth, and brotherhood"; (2) to the future of mankind at large; and (3) to the very happiness and security of our own country and sister republics in the Western Hemisphere, who will have to turn themselves FOR AN UNLIMITED TIME into an armed camp, ever ready to meet the hordes of blood-thirsty merciless aggressors whenever their super-lords are ready for the crime. At stake are not

words, opinions, dispositions, or personalities. Mankind itself is at the crossroads. The real terms of the actual dilemma are whether mankind is to turn back to the Dark Ages under stormtrooper Dictatorship, or are they to move forward towards a rejuvenated Democracy. A Fascist victory will be the greatest potential world force for the perpetuation of the greatest social evils, shaping with a most brutal reality human destiny for generations to come. Philosophically, we may of course choose an opinion (with Voltaire's "Good Brahmin") as to where and when happiness and reason can harmonize; but stark and uncouth and unphilosophical reality makes a timely choice most positive and urgent—a choice between the reign of the Gestapo and that of Democracy; the one offers terror and servitude, the other, with all its imperfections, offers life, liberty, and the pursuit of personal happiness to ever-increasing numbers of aspiring humanity. Without concealing or minimizing the gravity of those deadly iniquities and cancers which are fed by man's inhumanities to his own kind, the ungarnished fact remains that a victory of Nazi ideology supported by Fascist legions will not only set back for centuries human progress, but the very future of our own children and the very existence of a UNITY would be shrouded by the mantles of despair, servility, and death. And this is neither inflated fear nor imported propaganda. Ask the leaders of science, of culture, of religion who are still alive and in oppressed Europe, ask them what price living, and ponder over the fate of humanity should the dreadful victory materialize in favor of our common enemy. Is it not a matter of vital concern to ourselves, to our children, to our country, and to those generations to follow us, whose destinies are now in the hands of the present generation called to trial?

In view of the fact that some of your correspondents have dwelt upon a personal trend, I hope to be excused for the following little personal digression.

I suspect with regret that one of your correspondents (Flora White) has missed the entire issue, and I am deeply and sincerely grieved to find that my words uttered in open sincerity could so illy dispose such a considerate soul. In truth, it is because I have set aside (as your correspondent suggests) a portion of each day for the purpose of reflection, and because my reading does include the faithful study of the words and the spirit of the Prophets, of the Nazarene, of Gandhi, and the sages of all times and climes, that I am convinced more than ever that a Hitler-dictated peace and a world dominated by stormtroopers are the greatest menace engulfing human life and international destiny. And it is because of my profoundest respect and reverence for men and women so magnificently represented by the prophetic grandeur of John Haynes Holmes—a beacon of promising life in the midst of a world gone mad and in darkness—that I am persuaded that a peace now upon the terms of a victorious tyranny, dictated by brutality and regimented by "robot discipline and servile precision," will make it literally impossible for our prophetic voices to survive, let alone to be heard.

It was in the painful surroundings of the Army hospitals more than twenty-one years ago that the writer of these lines took a silent and solemn pledge, if and when he does go out into the world again in living condition, to do his best by dedicating himself to the task of peaceful enlightenment which would help to scatter the healing seeds of creative peace and human brotherhood in a world ruled by primitive passions and man-made wrongs. For nearly a year and a half, then confined to a wheelchair and a pair of crutches, he had ample time for earnest thought and decision.

It was also in the midst of those very surroundings crowded with the human shambles of the first World War that he made his first acquaintance (through the thoughtfulness of an unknown friend) with UNITY and that other human messenger of creative living, *The Friends Intelligencer,* published by the Society of Friends. This treasured introduction in those thought-provoking and heart-breaking surroundings of an Army hospital crowded with cripples, and wounded and disfigured men provided him with the will to live and gave him the mental strength and spiritual encouragement to carry on, offering the timely and most friendly guidance which made it possible for the writer to carry out his pledge of humble service in the great cause of human justice and healing peace. It was in the midst of those sad experiences of disillusionment that followed the-war-to-end-war that he refreshed his memory and gained mastery over the subject which made him combat injustice, persecution, bigotries, and servility wherever met. And it was there and then that he pledged anew his allegiance, without any reservations, to that "old-fashioned Americanism that is right in the hearts of our men and women,"—an Americanism which fights bigotry and injustice and crime; which gave birth to the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights; which made possible Washington's courage, Franklin's practical wisdom and industry, Jefferson's devotion to the cause of Democracy, and Lincoln's self-sacrificing love for the people and the Union.

Come, friends, let us reason. Without ill feeling, without condoning ill practices no matter where found, with renewed faith in the devotion to our beloved UNITY and its stirring message of Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion as led by its fearless Editor, in simple truth let us ask: Does not victorious Fascism spell the death of all things sublimely and eternally true, of all things devoutly good and eternally beautiful—those of material and spiritual value so dear to us all? In this crisis confronting the present generation, it is well to reread the *First Crisis* which was written by Paine and read to the American troops under the command of George Washington. It is of vital importance to ponder its lines of timely significance. "It is dearness only that gives everything its value." And, as Mr. Schaller aptly states it in your column, we do have a "rendezvous with Destiny." But will it be served best with stormtroopers goose-stepping the continents and dispatching their messengers of hate, bigotry, and terror throughout the world? It is only by guaranteeing a victory to the Democracies over Fascism and Totalitarianism that the Nazarene's Sermon on the Mount, that Gandhi's Soul Force of dynamic faith and living, and that love for peace and justice of a John Haynes Holmes can be made secure, to be heard with greater promises for universal triumph in the future. And only when fully united can Democracy, living in a free world, assert its true self, correct its own shortcomings in a peaceful manner, and grant an ever-greater share of liberty and justice, freedom and security, health and happiness for all.

It is the glory and inestimable value of a journal like UNITY to be able to stand for the wholesome agreement to disagree, bound by the ties of a single faith in the ultimate triumph of reason, truth, and universal justice, based upon good will and peace.

DAVID JOBMAN.

New York, N. Y.

An International Police

To UNITY:

The coöperation of three navies could maintain World Peace: The navies of Great Britain, the United States, and an International Navy built and supported by the rest of the nations desiring permanent peace.

The British Empire has a powerful navy and with it maintained peace over one fifth of the world's area, containing one fourth of its population. The United States has a large navy and for years has prevented foreign invasion of the Western Hemisphere which covers a large section of the earth's surface and contains 230 millions of its people. Now, if the Scandinavian countries, the South and Central American countries, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Greece, Turkey, Siam, Portugal, Ireland, China, and all the other peace-minded nations of the world would get together and build a large-sized International Navy, there would be three navies powerful enough to police the world. If this experiment proved successful, then one large International Navy, backed up by the man power and resources of the peaceful countries, could eventually take over the task. There would be nothing to lose and everything to gain; and nations, so desiring, could disarm in safety. No World Peace plan can ever be successful without the threat or use of an International Police.

W. F. FARRELL.

Chicago, Illinois.

UNITY'S Fairness

To UNITY:

UNITY is really doing a remarkable job of presenting both sides in this stirring question of pacifism—and it is especially remarkable in view of the Editor's pacifist convictions. I have not fallen quite over on the pacifist side, but I do want you to know that your fairness is appreciated.

G. GROTOPHORST.

Santa Clara, California.

Encouragement

To UNITY:

I can't tell you how much I have enjoyed reading the August issue of your magazine. Not only the editorials but the articles and letters were exceptionally good. Keep up the good work.

DAVID M. BLOCH.

Brooklyn, N. Y.